

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 18, 20-21, 23 and 27-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 18-21, 23, and 27-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulman (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,146) in view of kjorsvik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,190).

To establish a prima facie case for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings. (2) There must be a reasonable expectation of success. (3) The references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) for claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 18, 20-21, 23 and 27-34 , and that therefore, claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 18-21, 23, and 27-34 are allowable.

The Applicants' claimed invention is directed to network management requests, such as, Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) requests which are requests to retrieve or modify objects (information stored in a predefined format, for example, text strings, counter values) stored in a managed element (for example, router, terminal server, switch). The SNMP requests received by the managed element are prioritized by the managed element based on a user identifier in a network management message wrapper included in each request. (See Applicants' Specification Page 7, line 24 - Page 8, line 9.) The user identifier identifies the user of an application from which the request was sent. (See Applicants' Specification Fig. 3 and Page 7, lines 7-16.) The network management request is scheduled by the managed element dependent on the assigned priority value.

The Applicants disclosed management station (108) communicates over the network with a managed element (112). A network management request (300) including a network management wrapper (302) is received by the managed element (112). The network management request is added to the pending Q (510) or the active Q (508) in the managed element (112) based on priority included in the network management wrapper.

Turning to the cited references, Dulman is directed to the use of SNMP messages for monitoring network elements of a public switched telephone network. An operations console sends and receives SNMP messages from network elements via a packet switched network. A

network element includes an error monitoring system that collects and generates an error status report. The network element converts the error status report to SNMP messages and outputs the SNMP messages to the operations console. The operations console displays the SNMP messages (objects) together with operational priority that is assigned by the console.

Dulman does not teach or suggest a method for prioritizing a network management request sent by a management station to a managed element. Dulman does not teach or suggest prioritizing SNMP messages in the network element. Dulman merely discusses that the operating console can be kept up to date on the status of the network element by regular polling of the network elements and that the operating console can initiate corrective measures by outputting SNMP objects to different network elements. There is no discussion of how SNMP objects received by the network element are prioritized by the network element. Dulman's discussion of assigning an operational priority to an error reported by a network element by the operation console does not teach or suggest at least the applicants' claimed "the priority value assigned by the managed element". There is no discussion of how SNMP messages received by the network element are handled the network element.

The cited reference, Kjorsvik is directed to a presentation system for individual personal computers in a personal computer network. In lieu of displaying a screen saver on the screen of a personal computer that has been idle for a period of time, a repertoire of presentations stored in a system database located on a network server PC are provided for display on the personal computer. The repertoire of presentations take the form of a series of successive slides or screen images.

Kjorsvik's mere discussion of data displayed on screens of personal computers and identifying users of the personal computers based on a unique network identifier does not suggest the Applicants' claimed "user identifier in a network management wrapper". Kjorsvik does not even discuss a network management wrapper, network management request or even data transfer from the network server to the network PC. Furthermore, one skilled in the art of network management would not look to the use of screen savers on personal computers to prioritize network requests.

Thus, the Office has not established a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) because (1) there is no suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings (Dulman and Kjorsvik)

and (2) even if combined, Dulman and Kjorsvik do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as discussed above.

Furthermore, the failure of others to discuss assigning a priority value to the received network management request by the managed element is a secondary indication of non-obviousness. (*Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)).

As base Claims 1, 18, 27, 28, 29 and 30 recite novel subject matter, each of the dependent claims are also novel over Dulman and Kjorsvik, singly or in combination. The dependent claims also recite additional patentable limitations. Such limitations further distinguish the claimed invention and are not taught or suggested by Dulman and Kjorsvik, singly or in combination.

Claims 3, 20, and 33 recite that the priority value is added to “an authentication group comprising a plurality of users, in an authentication table”. Dulman does not even discuss an authentication group or table in the network element.

Claims 5, 21, 23, and 34 recite “determining the priority value by using the extracted user identifier to index the authentication table”. Dulman does not even discuss how SNMP messages are processed by the network element.

Claims 6 and 11 recite “selecting the order of execution of the network management request dependent on the determined priority value”. As already discussed, Dulman does not even discuss processing of SNMP messages received by a network element.

Applicants note that although the Office has rejected Claims 7-9 and 12-14 as being deemed unpatentable over Dulman in view of Kjorsvik, the Office has not indicated how claims 7-9 and 12-14 are deemed unpatentable over Dulman in view of Kjorsvik. Instead, the Office refers to Wiggins’ specification for support for a rejection that is not based on Wiggins. Claim 30 recites “the message is in the form of a Simple Network Management Request”. Dulman does not discuss processing of Simple Network Management Requests by a managed element.

Therefore, separately or in combination, Dulman and Kjorsvik do not teach or suggest the Applicants’ claimed invention. Thus, none of the cited prior art alone or in combination teaches or suggests the Applicants’ claimed method for prioritizing a network management request. Accordingly, the present invention as now claimed is not believed to be anticipated or made

obvious by the cited art or any of the prior art. In view of the foregoing, removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and acceptance of Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 18, 20-21, 23 and 27-34 are respectively requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Caroline M. Fleming  
Caroline M. Fleming  
Registration No. 45,566  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 2/17/05